

**REMARKS**

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-7 and 9-26 were pending in the application and were rejected in the Office Action. By way of this amendment and without adding new matter, Applicant has: (a) amended claims 1-3, 9, 14, 16, and 20; and (b) canceled claims 22, 24, and 26, due to their being incorporated into claims 1, 14, and 20, respectively. Accordingly, claims 1-7, 9-21, 23, and 25 are respectfully presented for further consideration.

Entry and consideration of this Amendment is warranted because it raises no new issues and does not warrant a further search. Specifically, the amendments made herein to independent claims 1, 14, and 20 were to recite limitations previously recited in dependent claims 22, 24, and 26, respectively. Similarly, the amendments made herein to: (a) dependent claims 2, 3, and 16 resolve minor formalistic issues under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as later discussed in detail; and (b) dependent claim 9 changes the dependency thereof to avoid a provisional double patenting rejection, also as later discussed in detail.

**1. Rejection of Claims 2-7, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2**

The Examiner rejected claims 2-7, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner rejected claim 2 (*i.e.*, the claim from which claims 5-7, 12, 13, and 15-19 depend), claim 3 (*i.e.*, the claim from which claims 4 and 10 depend), and claim 16 for various formalistic reasons. The rejection has been fully obviated with respect to claims 2-7, 10, 12, 13, and 15-19, by way of the clerical amendments made herein to claims 2, 3, and 16. In addition, the rejection has also been fully obviated with respect to claim 9, which has been amended to depend from claim 1. Accordingly, a withdrawal of this rejection is both warranted and earnestly solicited.

**2. Prior Art Rejections of Claims 1-7 and 9-26 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b), 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected:

- (a) claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 14, 20, 21, 23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by JP 9-118215 (“Hideaki”);
- (b) claims 2, 5-7, 12, 13, 22, 24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious in view of Hideaki; and
- (c) claims 11 and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious when considering Hideaki in view of WO 00/70628 (“Heise”).

Preliminarily, the aforementioned rejections of claims 22, 24, and 26 are now moot due to their being canceled as a result of their being incorporated in claims 1, 14, and 20, respectively. Accordingly, the rejections will be addressed, and respectfully traversed, with respect to claims 1-7, 9-21, 23, and 25.

**A. Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-19, and 21**

As amended herein, claim 1 (*i.e.*, the claim from which claims 2-7, 9-13, 15-19, and 21 depend) recites an electromagnetic valve unit. The electromagnetic valve unit includes, among other possible things (*italic and underline emphasis added*):

- a yoke of magnetic metal, the yoke comprising upper and lower walls that are integrally connected by side walls;
- a slit provided in the upper wall of the yoke, the slit extending along a longitudinal axis of the yoke between axially opposed ends of the yoke; and
- a plurality of electromagnetic valves abreast installed in the yoke in such a manner that the yoke constitutes outside magnetic paths of solenoid coils of the valves,

wherein each solenoid coil has terminal members that project outward from the yoke through the slit,

wherein the terminal members of every pair of the electromagnetic valves, which face each other with respect to the longitudinal axis of the yoke, are arranged close to one another and face one another, and

*wherein the lower wall of the yoke comprises two axially extending wall portions that extend along the side walls respectively and a middle portion through which the two axially extending wall portions are integrally connected.*

As hereafter explained, Hideaki and Heise (standing alone or combined) fail to teach or suggest such an electromagnetic valve unit.

In the described embodiments of the instant invention, the yoke 3 includes a lower wall 20 that, in turn, includes two axially extending (side) wall portions (each of which includes openings 22). *See e.g.* Figs. 1-5. The side wall portions of the lower wall 20 are joined by a middle portion in which a central opening 23 is provided. As shown best in Figure 4, the side wall portions and the middle portion are, as above-underlined, integrally connected. In contrast to the instantly recited invention, neither Hideaki nor Heise teaches or suggests a yoke that has each of the limitations recited in claim 1, including the above-underlined integral connection.

Hideaki<sup>1</sup>: As previously mentioned, claim 1 was amended to recite the limitations of previously dependent claim 22; the limitations of claim 22 are above-italicized in claim 1. In

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicant has not obtained a translation of Hideaki's Japanese text.

rejecting claim 22, the Examiner states that the middle portion of Hideaki's spring 31 "would form the recited middle portion." Office Action at p. 4. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Hideaki's element 31, which Applicants will assume is a spring based on the Examiner's usage of that term, is shown best in Figure 5. The spring 31 includes three sections 31a, 31b, 31c, which combine to support two yoke members 25, 26. Although the spring members 31a, 31b, 31c include a middle portion 31, which is supported by the other members 31b, 31c, the middle portion 31a is not integrally connected with either the other spring members 31b, 31c or with the yoke members 25, 26. Accordingly, in contrast to the limitations of claim 1, Hideaki fails to teach or suggest a yoke that includes a lower wall that, in turn, includes two side wall portions and a middle portion that are integrally connected.

Heise<sup>2</sup>: Heise teaches a sleeve body 2 (which houses an electromagnet 5) and that two such sleeve bodies 2 are placed side-by-side in a structure 7 such that what appears to be terminal pins 8 face each other. Further, a lower wall (unnumbered) of such structure 7 appears to have two side wall portions and a middle portion integrally connected thereto. However, the upper wall (unnumbered) of such structure 7 does not comprise a slit through which the terminal pins 8 upwardly extend and face each other; the only slits through which the terminal pins 8 extend are provided in the sleeve bodies 2, not the housing 7. In other words, although the terminal pins 8 may face each other, they do not face each other while upwardly extending through a common slit in an upper wall of a yoke (*i.e.*, the housing 7). Accordingly, Heise's structure 7 can not be analogized to the yoke recited in claim 1 and, therefore, Heise can not be used to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Hideaki.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, Hideaki and Heise (standing alone or combined) fail to teach or suggest at least the yoke recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the combination of Hideaki and Heise can not be used to reject claim 1, or any claim dependent thereon, under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b), 103(a). Moreover, as claims 2-7, 9-13, 15-19, and 21 depend from claim 1, each of these dependent claims is also allowable over Hideaki and Heise, without regard to the other patentable limitations recited therein. Therefore, a withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-19, and 21 under §§ 102(b), 103(a) is both warranted and earnestly solicited.

---

<sup>2</sup> Applicant has not obtained a translation of Heise's German text.

**B. Claims 14 and 23**

As amended herein, claim 14 (*i.e.*, the claim from which claim 23 depends) recites an electromagnetic valve unit. The electromagnetic valve unit includes, among other possible things (*italic and underline emphasis added*):

- a yoke of magnetic metal, the yoke comprising upper and lower walls that are integrally connected by side walls;
- a slit provided in the upper wall of the yoke, the slit extending along a longitudinal axis of the yoke between axially opposed ends of the yoke; and
- a plurality of electromagnetic valves abreast installed in the yoke in such a manner that the yoke constitutes outside magnetic paths of solenoid coils of the valves,
  - wherein each solenoid coil has terminal members that project outward from the yoke through the slit,
  - wherein the solenoid coils of the electromagnetic valves are arranged along the longitudinal axis forming a given number of pairs of the coils along the longitudinal axis,
  - wherein the terminal members of every pair of the electromagnetic valves, which face each other with respect to the longitudinal axis of the yoke, are arranged close to one another and face one another, and
  - wherein the lower wall of the yoke comprises two axially extending wall portions that extend along the side walls respectively and a middle portion through which the two axially extending wall portions are integrally connected.*

As hereafter explained, Hideaki fails to teach or suggest such an electromagnetic valve unit.

As previously discussed with respect to claim 1, Hideaki fails to teach or suggest a yoke that includes a lower wall that, in turn, includes two side wall portions and a middle portion that are integrally connected. As claim 14 also recites these limitations, the aforementioned arguments that were previously set forth with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 14.

For at least the aforementioned reason, Hideaki fails to teach or suggest at least the above-italicized limitations of claim 14. Accordingly, Hideaki can not be used to reject claim 14, or any claim dependent thereon, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Moreover, as claim 23 depends from claim 14, dependent claim 23 is also allowable over Hideaki, without regard to the other patentable limitations recited therein. Therefore, a withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14 and 23 under § 102(b) is both warranted and earnestly solicited.

**C. Claims 20 and 25**

As amended herein, claim 20 (*i.e.*, the claim from which claim 25 depends) recites an antilock brake system for a wheeled motor vehicle. The antilock brake system includes, among other possible things (*italic and underline emphasis added*):

a fluid line extending between a master cylinder of a brake pedal and brake cylinders of road wheels; and  
an electromagnetic valve unit arranged in the fluid line to selectively open and close the passage of the fluid line, the electromagnetic valve unit comprising:  
a yoke of magnetic metal, the yoke comprising upper and lower walls that are integrally connected by side walls;  
a slit provided in the upper wall of the yoke, the slit extending along a longitudinal axis of the yoke between axially opposed ends of the yoke; and  
a plurality of electromagnetic valves abreast installed in the yoke in such a manner that the yoke constitutes outside magnetic paths of solenoid coils of the valves,  
wherein each solenoid coil has terminal members that project outward from the yoke through the slit,  
wherein the terminal members of every pair of the electromagnetic valves, which face each other with respect to the longitudinal axis of the yoke, are arranged close to one another and face one another, and  
*wherein the lower wall of the yoke comprises two axially extending wall portions that extend along the side walls respectively and a middle portion through which the two axially extending wall portions are integrally connected.*

As hereafter explained, Hideaki fails to teach or suggest such an antilock brake system.

As previously discussed with respect to claim 1, Hideaki fails to teach or suggest a yoke that includes a lower wall that, in turn, includes two side wall portions and a middle portion that are integrally connected. As claim 20 also recites these limitations, the aforementioned arguments that were previously set forth with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 20.

For at least the aforementioned reason, Hideaki fails to teach or suggest at least the above-italicized limitations of claim 20. Accordingly, Hideaki can not be used to reject claim 20, or any claim dependent thereon, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Moreover, as claim 25 depends from claim 20, dependent claim 25 is also allowable over Hideaki, without regard to the other patentable limitations recited therein. Therefore, a withdrawal of the rejection of claims 20 and 25 under § 102(b) is both warranted and earnestly solicited.

### **3. Provisional Double Patenting Rejection of Claim 9**


Claim 9 was provisionally rejected as being duplicative of claim 4. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is now moot due to the amendment made herein to claim 9, *i.e.*, the claim 9 now depends from claim 1 rather than claim 3, which is the claim from which claim 4 depend. Accordingly, a withdrawal of this provisional rejection is also respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

For the aforementioned reasons, claims 1-7, 9-21, 23, and 25 are now in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if such communication would expedite the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 28, 2006

By 

Customer Number: 22428

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

3000 K Street, N.W.

Suite 500

Washington, D.C. 20007-5143

Pavan K. Agarwal

Registration No. 40,888

Frederic T. Tenney

Registration No. 47,131

Telephone: (202) 672-5300

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Attorneys for Applicant

THE COMMISSIONER IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO CHARGE ANY ADDITIONAL FEES WHICH MAY BE REQUIRED REGARDING THIS APPLICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, OR CREDIT ANY OVERPAYMENT, TO DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 19-0741. SHOULD NO PROPER PAYMENT BE ENCLOSED HERewith, AS BY A CHECK BEING IN THE WRONG AMOUNT, UNSIGNED, POST-DATED, OTHERWISE IMPROPER OR INFORMAL OR EVEN ENTIRELY MISSING, THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED TO CHARGE THE UNPAID AMOUNT TO DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 19-0741. IF ANY EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE NEEDED FOR TIMELY ACCEPTANCE OF PAPERS SUBMITTED HERewith, APPLICANT HEREBY PETITIONS FOR SUCH EXTENSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 AND AUTHORIZES PAYMENT OF ANY SUCH EXTENSIONS FEES TO DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 19-0741.